

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 have been amended to more precisely claim compressing static elements of a web page in a cache and subsequently transmitting or serving the compressed static elements to another location. Claims 23-28 added. No claims have been canceled. Claims 23-28 remain pending in this application.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Melbin '217 in view of Grupta et al. '252. Applicant respectfully suggests that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for two reasons. First, there is no suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference, or to combine the reference teachings. Secondly, the cited references, when combined, fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The necessary teaching or suggestion to make the claim combination and the reasonable expectation of success is not both found in the cited references. Melbin '217 and Grupta et al. '252 considered individually or together in combination, fail to suggest or teach all of the elements of the presently pending claims. For example, neither Melbin '217 nor Grupta et al. '252 teach the storage of compressed information including static elements of a web page in a cache of a web server as presently claimed in independent claims 1, 7, 12 or 17.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and therefore are allowable over Melbin '217 and Grupta et al. '252 for the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 8-11 depend from claim 7 and therefore are allowable over Melbin '217 and Grupta et al. '252 for the same reasons that claim 7 is allowable. Claims 13-15 depend from claim 12 and therefore are allowable over Melbin '217 and Grupta et al. '252 for the same reasons that claim 12 is allowable. Claims 18-22 depend from claim 17 and therefore are allowable over Melbin '217 and Grupta et al. '252 for the same reasons that claim 17 is allowable.

Therefore, Melbin '217 and Gupta et al. '252 fail to teach the present invention as claimed and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims 1-22 are now believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Digital River, Inc.
By attorneys/agents:

Moore, Hansen & Sumner, PLLP
225 South Sixth Street
Suite 4850
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 332-8200

Date: 26 October 2004

By 
Shawn B. Dempster, Registration No. 34,321